DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 379 08 VT 012 869

TITLE	Commuter Job Corps. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Utah Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, Salt Lake City.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-3046
PUB DATE	Jun 70
GRANT	OEG-4-7-063046-1612
NOTE	45p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Commuting Students, *Dropout Rehabilitation, *Dropouts, *Followup Studies, Job Training, Potential Dropouts, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Research Coordinating Units, Secondary Education, Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Utah

ABSTRACT

To evaluate the effectiveness of a commuter job corps program, evaluation data were obtained from participants, instructors, administrators, and a control group. Designed specifically for high school dropouts and run in conjunction with the local school districts, this program was evaluated in terms of (1) student retention, (2) return-to-school rate, (3) the employment rate, and (4) grades. Analysis of the data revealed that the commuter job corps program resulted in a retention rate of 50 percent and a summer employment rate of 80 percent. Intuitively, it was concluded that this program should be continued, but it was further noted that better methods of gathering data are needed. (JS)

ED051379

RECEIVED
MAR 1 1971
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 063046
Grant No. OEG-4-7-063046-1612

COMMUTER JOB CORPS

June 1970

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VT012869

ED051379

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-3046
Grant No. OEG-4-7-063046-1612

COMMUTER JOB CORPS

John F. Stephens, Project Director
Utah Coordinating Unit for Research in
Vocational and Technical Education
1670 University Club Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

March 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

LeGrand P. Backman, Chairman
1361 Princeton Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah 84105

Helen B. Ure, Vice-Chairman
3105 South 17th East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106

Sheldon S. Allred
219 North Carbon Avenue
Price, Utah 84501

Gyle E. Riddle
Antimony
Utah 84712

Edna H. Baker
777 South 6th East
Logan, Utah 84321

Dexter C. Snow
83 North 100 East
St. George, Utah 84770

A. Reed Morrill
895 North 150 East
Provo, Utah 84601

N. Russell Tanner
1744 - 24th Street
Ogden, Utah 84403

Burton F. Brasher
4180 West 5451 South
Kearns, Utah 84118

Walter D. Talbot, Executive Officer
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Salt Lake City, Utah

LaPreal Wight, Secretary
Salt Lake City, Utah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ABSTRACT 1

A. Problem: 1
B. Purpose 1
C. Method 1
D. Results 1

II. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 1

III. INTRODUCTION 1

A. Statement of the Problem 2
B. Description of the Program 2
C. Evaluation Design 3
D. Control Group 4
E. Comparisons to be Produced 4

IV. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS 4

A. Retention 5
B. Attendance 5
C. Grades 6
D. Student Questionnaire 6
E. Rating of Trainees 7

V. FOLLOW-UP 7

A. Commuter Job Corps Participants 7
B. Control Group Follow-Up 8

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 8

A. Attendance 8

APPENDIXES 10-40

ABSTRACT

Problem: To evaluate the effectiveness of a commuter job corps program designed for high school dropouts and potential dropouts and run in conjunction with the local school districts from which participants were drawn.

Purpose: To ascertain the success of the program in terms of student retention, return-to-school, employment rate, and grades and to determine whether such a commuter job corps program should be set up on a permanent basis.

Method: Quarterly evaluations as well as a follow-up of the program were obtained from participants, instructors and administrators, along with an evaluation from the control group. Attendance figures and grades were also documented.

Results: A retention rate of 50 percent prevailed with 72 percent of the trainees in the "A" or "B" grade category. Almost 80 percent of the participants obtained summer employment but the number of those who returned to school in the fall of 1969 is unknown.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been intuitively concluded that the commuter job corps program is a valuable project and it is recommended that another pilot program be instigated with definite outlines for accumulation of data, accurate coordination and record-keeping, and successful follow-up.

INTRODUCTION

The Clearfield Non-Resident, or Commuter, Job Corps Program was begun on October 14, 1968 as a cooperative venture, on an experimental basis, between the Thiokol-Clearfield Job Corps Center, the Utah State Board of Education, and the Ogden and Box Elder school districts. A total of 40 boys went to Clearfield on October 14; two were from Bear River High School (Box Elder School District), 15 were from Box Elder High School, and 23 were from Ogden High School.

The boys who reported to Clearfield on that first day had been classified as "potential dropouts" by their high schools. This classification was based on attendance, grades, and personal habits of the students.

The program was designed to kindle sufficient interest in these boys to keep them in school, preferably until graduation or at least until they obtained a marketable job skill. Thus, the boys were allowed to choose their own vocational training program. (Although the General Aptitude Test Battery was administered to this first group, the results were not used for placement.)

Travel played an important part in the nature of the program for the two groups. Since Ogden High School was only twenty minutes away by bus, the Ogden students took a diminished schedule of classes (usually three) at their high school, then traveled to Clearfield after lunch for their vocational training which comprised three and one half hours under the tutelage of Job Corps vocational instructors. The Box Elder group which had a journey of about 60 minutes from Brigham City and 90 minutes from Garland (Bear River High School) took no classes at their high school. In addition to their vocational instruction, they received two hours of instruction each day in basic education (reading, mathematics, personal development and language arts) in a room with materials provided by the Job Corps Center. The instructor for those two hours was also the coordinator for the program, Mr. Clark White. Mr. White was not a certified teacher but was hired to serve as liaison between the Job Corps Center and Box Elder High School. The students progressed at their own rates in this portion of the program as did both groups in their vocational programs.

Evaluation of this program was assigned to the Research Coordinating Unit of the Division of Research and Innovation, Utah State Board of Education.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to evaluate the effectiveness of a commuter program for high school dropouts and potential dropouts operated by the Clearfield Job Corps Center (CJCC) in conjunction with Ogden and Box Elder School District. The Utah State Board for Vocational Education coordinated the program. The effectiveness was measured by success in retaining the trainees in the program until its completion, and in the demonstrated ability of the graduates to obtain and retain a job after completing the program. A control group was used for evaluative purposes, as described under comparisons to be produced.

Description of the Program

The pilot program was operated by the Thiokol Chemical Corporation's Urban Job Corps Center in Clearfield, Utah, and the Utah State Board of Vocational Education from 14 October 1968 through September 1969. A total of fifty dropouts and/or potential dropouts from Ogden, Box Elder, and Bear River High Schools participated in the project. The Ogden students spent three and one-half hours per day at the Job Corps Center in vocational training in a field of the student's choice. The students from Box Elder and Bear River spent an equal amount of time per day in vocational training, and also spent two hours each day receiving basic education instruction (Reading, Mathematics, Personal Development, Language Arts). This instruction utilized Job Corps materials and was provided in a room at the CJCC under the direction of the coordinator from Box Elder. Basic education for the Ogden students took place at Ogden High School, using standard high school materials. On-the-job training in community industries was provided for the trainees during

June, July, and August 1969. Job placement arranged by Clearfield Job Corps Center's placement services was to be provided at the completion of the training program.

Evaluation Design

A. The following data was collected:

1. The CJCC vocational instructors were asked to rate each trainee's skill development periodically during the training period on the standard Clearfield JCC Training Record, and also to submit a training rating for each trainee to the high schools periodically as required by the public school grading periods.

2. The vocational instructors were requested to rate each trainee on certain job behaviors every eight weeks during the training period on a Student Rating Sheet. The Student Rating Sheet was provided by the Principal Investigator.

3. The counselors and general education instructors from the high schools were also asked to rate each trainee on the job behaviors on the Student Rating Sheet every eight weeks during the training period.

4. Each student was requested to complete a brief survey of his attitudes toward school, work, the commuter program, and himself several times during the project period.

B. Records of students who leave the Commuter program before completion, their reasons for leaving, and whether they leave or remain in high school were maintained over the period of the project. Data was also compiled on a matched control group to determine the frequency with which this group remained in high school in a conventional program.

C. The information described in Section A is intended to provide a preliminary evaluation of the program by measuring the extent to which the trainees have gained a marketable skill. To provide actual data on the acquisition of a marketable skill, the following data was gathered:

1. Follow-up data on the experimental group was gathered in September 1969 and February 1970, to determine:

   a. how many trainees have returned to full-time school
   b. how many trainees are working

2. Comparable follow-up data on the matched control group of dropouts and potential dropouts will be gathered in September 1969 and February 1970.

Control Group

The control group was composed of dropouts and potential dropouts in numbers equal to their proportion in the experimental group. The dropouts were selected from the 1967-68 dropouts from Ben Lomond, Sky View, Tooele, and Granite high schools. These four high schools were asked to identify a group of students who were potential school dropouts in September 1968.

A list of desired matching characteristics were derived by the Principal Investigator for use in selecting members of the Control Group.

Comparisons to be Produced

Inasmuch as there were variations between the total programs followed by the Ogden and Box Elder groups, attempts were made to assess significant differences between them, including, but not limited to, a comparison of the relative effectiveness of the two basic education programs.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The difference between the Box Elder program and the Ogden program was substantial. Mr. Fred Draayer, the Ogden High School Coordinator, is a teacher and coach at the school. This, plus the fact that the trainees received daily classes at the school helped to establish a greater rapport between the students and their school administration. The Ogden High School principal, Dr. William Garner, encouraged the boys to attend and participate in school atheltic and social functions and the trainees had their usual access to counselors and facilities at the high school. The net effect, or so it appeared to the principal investigator, was the establishment of surprising rapport between the Ogden group, the school, and the administration.

The difference in the programs did not favor Ogden High School in every respect, however. The Box Elder coordinator spent each day with the boys and established a fine working relationship with them. He was always accessible to them and earned their respect by performing well his function of providing liaison between the high school, the students, the job corps, and the vocatinal instructors. On the other hand, Mr. Draayer, the Ogden coordinator had other duties during much of the school year and was not able to provide the support and influence which his students would have liked. This problem was remedied, however, in the early spring when Draayer's coaching duties were ended and he was able to spend full time with the boys.

It was hoped that the timing of the program would enable the trainees to undergo on-the-job training during the summer months after completing their vocational training. In fact, some of the boys completed their training early and began OJT before the school year was over while others

were unable to complete their training at all because of slow progress or a late start. Some of the latter desired to go on to summer school and complete their vocational training.

Retention

As the 1968-69 school year ended (on May 23 for Box Elder, June 6 for Ogden, and May 29 for vocational training at the CJCC), the following data was compiled regarding the accomplishments of the forty three boys in the experimental group. This group included those who entered the program before December 31, 1968 and remained in the program for at least one month. Eleven of Ogden's twenty three and nine of Box Elder's twenty remained in the program to year's end. Thus, if successful retention is defined as retaining the corpsmen in the program until completion of the program or high school graduation, then 20 of the 43 persons in the program must be deemed successes.

In addition, at year's end, three trainees from Box Elder had successfully completed graduation requirements and graduated with their class on May 23, 1969. Ogden had one trainee who had completed graduation requirements at mid-year and one who graduated with their class on June 6, 1969.

Following is a list of the number of dropouts and their reasons for leaving the program.

REASON	OGDEN	BOX ELDER
Deceased	1	0
Suspended from school	3	0
Jailed	0	2
Entered Armed Forces	1	1
Completed graduation requirements	1	0
Other*	6	8

*Reasons included: summer employment in fields of training and non-training, conflict with other trainees, lack of individual instruction or interest in the program, and high school dropout.

Attendance

Attendance figures were compiled for just those students who stayed with the program, so that dropouts did not effect the percentages. As can be seen on page 6, the figures are quite high for a high school drop-out rate of trainees.

	OGDEN GROUP		BOX ELDER GROUP		BOTH	
	NO.	PERCENT	NO.	PERCENT	NO.	PERCENT
DAYS ENROLLED	2,260	-	2,135	-	4,395	-
DAYS ATTENDED	1,731	76.6%	1,650	77.3%	3,381	76.9%
DAYS ABSENT	529	23.4%	485	22.7%	1,014	23.1%

The breakdown of attendance records may be found in Appendix A.

Grades

A quarterly breakdown of grades appears in Appendix B. Almost without exception, each trainee, at the time he entered the program, bore a high school grade point average below "C." After totalling the grades for the entire year at the job corps center, one finds a surprising 42% of the participants in the "B" range. Even more significant would be that 30% in the "A" range, and only 22% in the "C" range. A mere 6% of the trainees fell into the "D" range.

No learned conclusion or statement can be made about this abnormally skewed grade curve due to lack of information on the part of the researcher. Perhaps the instructors felt that an indication of success could be portrayed to the trainee by the issuance of high grades. It is unknown also whether there were strict criteria set up for a grading system.

Student Questionnaire

A questionnaire was distributed among the participants at three different times during their training, which was designed to elicit responses in areas of reasoning behind participation, expectations of participants and need fulfillment. Although the responses were erratic (complete questionnaire and responses may be found in Appendix C) it seems evident that most trainees were somewhat enthused about the program, mainly because it could provide the tools necessary for obtaining better employment opportunity for them.

It should be noted that it was not possible to obtain evaluations from or on all trainees for each evaluation because of the shifting nature of the groups, i.e., dropouts, late additions, etc., plus the fact that it was not always possible to obtain completed evaluation sheets from the varied sources due to such reasons as a teacher not knowing the student well enough, poor attendance or no attendance, etc. As a partial, although not altogether satisfactory, solution to the problem, the following was done: The group was compared, for purposes of the evaluations, to those who enrolled in the program between October 14 and December 31, 1968 and who remained for at least one month. No evaluations were considered unless they came from members of this basic group.

Comments on the various phases of the program obtained from both groups can be found in Appendix D.

Rating of Trainees

A rating form was also distributed three times during the program, one each to be completed by the trainees themselves, by the coordinator, the job corps instructors and the high school teachers involved. The form covered areas of reliability, cooperation, responsibility, initiative, and attitude. (A complete tabulation of results is set forth in Appendix E). As would be expected, the trainees saw themselves in the "always-usually" dimension of all five attributes. The personnel involved in the rating were not so optimistic in their scoring, but very seldom dropped their ratings to the "rarely-never" category, thus implying that the majority of the trainees fit into an average realm of being reliable, cooperative, and responsible, taking some initiative with acceptable attitudes.

FOLLOW-UP

Commuter Job Corps Participants

A follow-up questionnaire was mailed out 20 October 1969 to all participants (39) who were believed to be living in the State at that time. The purpose of this survey was to determine the overall effect of the commuter job corps training on the current activities of the involved students. Four questionnaires were returned "Addressee Unknown," thus decreasing the survey field to 35. Fourteen participants responded, producing a 40% return. See Appendix F for a copy of the questionnaire and a complete summation of results.

At a glance, it might seem that these responses do not sufficiently support the recommendation that a commuter job corps program be established in Utah. Upon further study and perhaps intuitive analysis, it appears to this office that the commuter job corps experimental program was successful in several areas. Starting with question 1 of the questionnaire it is seen that although only 14% of the respondents obtained jobs demanding skills for which they had been trained, an overwhelming 79% worked during the summer. Also 14% were involved in either the armed forces or the Neighborhood Youth Corps, leaving only 1 respondent (7%) "a loafer." Such a high rate of employment does not seem characteristic of the regular "drop-out" or "potential drop-out" group. Although such a judgment might be considered speculative, the high figures could be due to some stimulation received during participation in the commuter job corps program.

Questions 2 and 4 reveal that 8 (58%) students have returned to high school to complete graduation requirements and that 3 of these students have graduated. Of the remaining participants (6) who did not return to school, 50% (3) are serving in the armed forces and receiving technical training, one is participating in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and two are doing nothing at this time, (although one of these two stated he was trying to get back into school).

Although the results of this questionnaire do not reveal definite causal relationships, it is indicative, due to the high percentage of employed

students and students in school, that the commuter job corps program could have been responsible for this positive result.

Control Group Follow-up

At the same time students were chosen for the commuter job corps training program, a matched group of students was chosen to participate in a control group survey. These individuals were chosen on the basis of their similarity (drop-out, potential drop-out) to the job corps participants.

Questionnaires were mailed to each of the 67 members of the control group at the same time the follow-up questionnaire was mailed to the actual participants. There was only a 22% (15) return from the control group. A copy of the questionnaire and the results may be found in Appendix G.

It is assumed that probably only the more responsible individuals responded. The response to Question 3 reveals that no participant took part in any type of vocational training program, the only characteristic which makes the control group different from the actual participating group.

Due to the scanty and uninformative return, the results of the control group follow-up study are not relevant to either the possible establishment of a commuter job corps program or the entire abolition of the plan.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been nearly impossible to make any valid, objective conclusions or recommendations concerning the commuter job corps program due to insufficient data and poor follow-up techniques. But the following observances will be noted.

Dr. William Garner, then principal of Ogden High School and now superintendent of Ogden City School District commented when he sent about twenty boys to Clearfield in mid-October to participate in the non-resident program, he thought that a retention rate of one-third at the end of one month would make the program a definite success. Almost eight months later, nine of that original group remained in the program and completed the school year there. By Dr. Garner's formula, the program is a definite success. It is unknown how many of those who completed the year's training at the Commuter Job Corp Center will return to school next year, but the program can already be considered a qualified success because it provided an alternative to a number of boys who would not have remained in school for more than a month, according to Dr. Garner, had they remained in their regular high school program.

Attendance

Attendance figures, which have been adjusted according to the number of drop outs, seem to be quite high and not characteristic of the group of

trainees. Interest in the program on the part of the boys is deemed the explanation for the high attendance rates.

The rating forms and grade break-downs indicate that the participants were sufficiently stimulated to take more of an interest in their job corps program than they did in their regular high school program. This indicates the value of such a commuter job corps program for high school drop-outs and potential drop-outs.

Because of the poor follow-up response it is impossible to infer that the commuter job corps participants had an advantage over the control group participants along the lines of training for better employment opportunity. As noted in this follow-up study in Appendix G there was much dissappointment on the part of program participants concerning job placement. According to the trainees, participation in the commuter job corps program more or less guaranteed job placement upon graduation. In actuality, this sort of service was not carried out, although it was originally part of the program.

Intuitively, the commuter job corps program appears to be valuable although the instigation of such a program on a permanent basis can't be definitely supported or refuted. It is therefore recommended that another pilot program be run with the hope of future continuance. The following factors should be incorporated:

1) Provisions must be made for accurate coordination on all levels of the program.
2) Complete records must be kept so that data concerning all phases of the program can be easily obtained.
3) There must be a successful follow-up program which will allow periodic analysis of the success of the project.
4) All goals of the project must be attained, especially job placement for trainees after completion of the program.

APPENDIXES

A P P E N D I X A

COMMUTER TRAINEES ATTENDANCE RECORD AT COMMUTER JOB CORPS CENTER

OGDEN GROUP

NO.	DATE ENROLLED	DATE LEFT	DAYS ENROLLED	DAYS PRESENT	DAYS ABSENT
1	10/14/68	4/14/69	107	53	54
2	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	140	9
3	10/14/68	1/24/69	62	46	16
4	10/14/68	4/18/69	97	59	38
5	11/13/68	11/13/68	1	1	0
6	10/14/68	11/19/68	62	41	21
7	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	106	43
8	10/14/68	1/26/69			
	4/14/69	5/29/69	84	64	20
9	10/14/68	1/24/69	62	29	33
10	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	133	16
11	11/12/68	5/29/69	128	127	1
12	10/14/68	1/ 6/69	57	37	20
13	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	129	20
14	10/14/68	3/ 4/69	Deceased--RCD not available		
15	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	100	49
16	10/14/68	4/10/69	117	101	16
17	10/14/68	5/29/69	144	88	56
18	12/10/68	5/29/69	108	74	34
19	11/13/68	1/24/69	40	25	15
20	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	132	17
21	10/14/68	2/ 7/69	84	58	26
22	10/14/68	5/29/69	149	130	19
23	10/14/68	1/24/69	64	58	6

BOX ELDER GROUP

1	12/11/68	5/23/69	107	77	30
2	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	131	16
3	10/14/68	2/ 7/69	82	57	25
4	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	122	25
5	10/14/68	4/ 4/69	114	78	36
6	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	100	47
7	12/30/68	5/23/69	141	98	43
8	10/30/68	1/27/69	51	36	15
9	10/14/68	2/ 3/69	72	44	28
10	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	100	47
11	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	111	36
12	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	142	5
13	10/14/68	5/23/69	147	121	26
14	10/14/68	4/25/69	122	92	30
15	10/14/68	4/25/69	92	80	12
16	10/22/68	2/ 7/69	66	40	26
17	10/14/68	4/25/69	122	110	12
18	10/14/68	11/25/68	37	28	9
19	10/14/68	12/ 2/68	37	37	0
20	11/14/68	1/27/69	63	46	17
		TOTALS:	2,135	1,650	485
		PERCENTAGES:	-	77.3%	22.7%

A P P E N D I X B

ATTENDANCE AND GRADES FOR BASIC EDUCATION CLASSES

OGDEN GROUP

GRADES	DATES			
	SEPT.11-NOV.11	NOV.14-JAN.24	JAN.27-MAR.28	MAR.30-JUNE 6
A	2	2	1	7
B	2	2	4	2
C	6	8	12	3
D	19	19	16	-
F	10	7	36	-
WF	1	0	0	-
WP	3	0	0	-
GPA'S				
4.0	0	0	0	-
3.0-3.9	0	0	0	-
2.0-2.9	2	2	1	2
1.0-1.9	8	9	5	4
.1- .9	4	2	10	-
0	0	1	2	-
ATTENDANCE				
TOTAL	150**	186**	427*	150*
AVERAGE	11**	13**	24*	12*
PERSONS	14**	14**	18*	12*

*Average absences per class
**Whole day absences

GRADES (2 courses each)	OCT.14-JAN.10	JAN.13-MAY 23	OCT.14-JAN.10	JAN.13-MAY 23
A	2	1		
B	0	6		
C	15	14		
D	13	3		
F	0	0		
WF	4	0		
CLASSES DROPPED	2	6		
GPA'S				
4.0			1	0
3.0-3.9			0	2
2.0-2.9			6	8
1.0-1.9			8	2
.1- .9			0	0
0			2	0

ATTENDANCE AT COMMUTER JOB CORPS CENTER

FIRST PERIOD (October 14-November 8)	OGDEN GROUP	BOX ELDER GROUP
Potential man-days attendance	370	279
Actual man-days attendance	315	228
Attendance percentage	85%	82%
SECOND PERIOD (November 11-January 24)		
Potential man-days attendance	1,032	593
Actual man-days attendance	611	400
Attendance percentage	59%	67%
THIRD PERIOD (January 26-June 1)		
Potential man-days attendance	858	1,263
Actual man-days attendance	805	1,022
Attendance percentage	94%	80%

GRADES*

Ogden group:

DATE	A NO/PCT	B NO/PCT	C NO/PCT	D NO/PCT	INCOMPLETE NO/PCT	DROPPED NO/PCT	TOTALS NO/PCT
October 14-November 8	9 50%	8 44%	1 6%	-	-	-	18
November 11-January 24	4 18%	9 41%	8 36%	1 5%	-	-	22
January 26-June 1	6 27%	2 9%	3 14%	-	-	11 50%	22

Box Elder group:

October 14-November 8	4 27%	8 53%	1 7%	2 13%	-	-	15
November 11-January 24	3 18%	9 53%	2 12%	1 5%	2 12%	-	17
January 26-June 1	1 6%	2 12%	5 29%	1 6%	1 6%	7 41%	17

*See Appendix D for first semester grades and Appendix F for second semester grades at Clearfield Job Corps Center.

A P P E N D I X B

CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS URBAN CENTER
OGDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT - COMMUTER PROGRAM

NO.	PROGRAM	GRADE AND ATTENDANCE RECORD							
		10/14/68 to 11/8/68				11/11/68 to 1/24/69			
		Enrl	Abs	Pres	Grade	Enrl	Abs	Pres	Grade
1	Medical	15	5	10	B+	52	22	30	B
2	Farm	20	6	14	A	52	26	26	B-
3	Automotive	20	0	20	A	52	14	38	B
4	Medical	20	2	18	A	52	22	30	A-
5	Baking					50	19	31	C
6	Medical	20	6	14	B+	52	22	30	B+
7	Medical	20	0	20	A	52	22	30	B+
8	Automotive	20	4	16	B	52	27	25	C
9	Automotive	20	1	19	A	52	23	29	C
10	Machine Shop					51	11	40	A
11	Automotive	20	3	17	B	52	35	17	C
12	Farm	20	0	20	A	52	18	34	B+
13	Machine Shop	20	3	17	A-	52	29	23	C-
14	Automotive	20	1	19	A	52	30	22	C
15	Machine Shop	20	7	13	C	52	29	23	C+
16	Medical	15	4	11	B+	52	22	30	A-
17	Baking					50	23	27	C
18	Automotive	20	0	20	A	52	18	34	B
19	Automotive	20	2	18	B	52	26	26	B
20	Automotvie	20	2	18	B	52	21	31	B
21	Automotive	20	2	18	B	52	31	21	X
22	Medical					34	20	14	A

Grading System

A = 90-100 D = 64-69
B = 80-89 F = Under 64
C = 70-79 Inc = Incomplete
X = Terminated

BOX ELDER SCHOOL DISTRICT
COMMUTER PROGRAM

NO.	PROGRAM	GRADE AND ATTENDANCE RECORD							
		10/14/68 to 11/8 68				11/11/68 to 1/10/69			
		Enrl	Abs	Pres	Grade	Enrl	Abs	Pres	Grade
1	Automotive					23	08	15	B+
2	Baking	20	2	18	B	42	10	32	B+
3	Automotive	20	2	18	B+	42	22	20	A+
4	Automotive	20	1	14	B+	42	24	18	B-
5	Meatcutting	20	5	15	B	42	18	24	D+
6	Plastics	20	3	17	A	42	13	29	B+
7	Medical					42	12	30	A
8	Baking	8	2	6	C	42	21	21	Inc
9	A/C	17	7	10	B	42	22	20	C-
10	Automotive	20	8	12	B+	42	27	25	B+
11	Automotive	20	5	15	B-	42	30	12	C-
12	Baking	20	3	17	D	42	10	32	B
13	Automotive	20	0	20	B+	42	25	17	B-
14	Automotive	20	1	19	A-	42	21	21	A+
15	Baking	20	0	20	A	42	10	32	B+
16	Baking	14	6	8	D	42	16	26	Inc
17	Automotive	20	1	19	A-	42	16	26	B+

Grading Scale

A = 90-100	D = 65-69
B = 80-89	F = Under 64
C = 70-79	Inc = Incomplete
	X = Terminated

A P P E N D I X B

GRADES FROM JOB CORP CENTER

(Second Semester)

OGDEN GROUP -- GRADE			
Student	No.	1	A
"	"	2	C
"	"	3	C
"	"	4	A
"	"	5	A
"	"	6	A
"	"	7	B
"	"	8	B
"	"	9	C
"	"	10	A
"	"	11	A

BOX ELDER GROUP -- GRADE			
Student	No.	1	B
"	"	2	C
"	"	3	C
"	"	4	A
"	"	5	C
"	"	6	C
"	"	7	C
"	"	8	B
"	"	9	-- In jail since April 25, 1969
"	"	10	D
"	"	11	-- Dropped out April 25, 1969
"	"	12	-- Dropped out April 25, 1969
"	"	13	-- Dropped out April 4, 1969

A P P E N D I X C

Trainee's Name _____ Form B

Social Security # _____

Vocational Cluster _____ Date _____

1. BEFORE BEGINNING THE COMMUTER PROGRAM AT THE CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS CENTER, WHAT WERE YOUR IDEAS TOWARD THE PROGRAM?

   (Please circle the letter before the answer closest to your ideas)

   A. I was very excited about it

   B. I was somewhat excited about it

   C. It seemed o.k.

   D. It didn't sound very good

   E. I didn't want to enter the program

2. AFTER WORKING IN THE COMMUTER PROGRAM AT THE CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS CENTER, WHAT DO YOU NOW THINK ABOUT IT?

   (Please circle the letter before the answer closest to your ideas)

   A. I think it is a great program

   B. I think it is a pretty good program

   C. Its o.k.

   D. I don't think its very good

   E. I don't like it at all

3. ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ACCORDING TO THE WAY YOU FEEL ABOUT THE COMMUTER PROGRAM AT THE JOB CORPS CENTER.

   (Circle "yes" or "no" after each question)

   A. I entered the Commuter Program mainly because I figured that the training would help me get a job yes no

   B. The schedule interferes with other things I'd like to do yes no

C. The vocational programs offered at the Job Corps Center interest me very much — yes no

D. I like the regular Corpsmen — yes no

E. This kind of training interests me more than what I was taking at my high school — yes no

F. I dislike having to travel so far every day — yes no

G. I like the atmosphere at the Job Corps Center more than at my high school — yes no

H. We do get enough opportunity to know the regular members of the Job Corps — yes no

I. I like the Job Corps vocational instructors — yes no

J. I like the Job Corps vocational instructors more than the teachers from my high school — yes no

K. The food in the cafeteria there is better than in my high school — yes no

4. BEFORE STARTING THE COMMUTER PROGRAM AT THE CLARFIELD JOB CORPS CENTER, HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT GETTING A STEADY JOB?
(Circle the one answer closest to your feelings)

A. I didn't think about it very much

B. I didn't think I'd have any trouble getting a good job

C. I figured that I'd be able to get some job, even if I didn't like it

D. I didn't think I'd be able to find a job

5. NOW, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT GETTING A STEADY JOB?
(Circle the one answer closest to your feelings)

A. I don't think about it very much

B. I don't think I'll have any trouble getting a good job

C. I think that I'll be able to get some job, even if I don't like it

D. I don't think I'll be able to get a job

6. DO YOU THINK YOU WILL BE ABLE TO GET A BETTER JOB BECAUSE OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE COMMUTER PROGRAM AT THE CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS CENTER THAN IF YOU HAD NOT ENTERED THE PROGRAM?

yes no

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

A P P E N D I X C

Date of Birth:_____ First letter of Last Name /__/

Vocational Cluster: _____

1. BEFORE beginning the Commuter Program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center, what were your ideas toward the program?

   (Please circle the letter before the answer closest to your ideas)

   A. I was very excited about it

   B. I was somewhat excited about it

   C. It seemed o.k.

   D. It didn't sound very good

   E. I didn't want to enter the program

2. AFTER working in the Commuter Program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center, what do you now think about it?

   (Please circle the letter before the answer closest to your ideas)

   A. I think it is a great program

   B. I think it is pretty good

   C. It is O. K.

   D. I don't think it is very good

   E. I don't like it at all

3. Answer the following questions according to the way you feel about the Commuter Program at the Job Corps Center.

   (Circle "yes" or "no" after each question)

   A. I entered the Commuter Program mainly because I figured the training would help me get a job yes no

   B. The schedule interferes with other things I would like to do yes no

   C. The vocational programs offered at the Job Corps Center interest me very much yes no

D. I like the regular Corpsmen yes no

E. This kind of training interests me more than what I was taking at my high school yes no

F. I dislike having to travel so far every day yes no

G. I like the atmosphere at the Job Corps Center more than at my high school yes no

H. We get enough opportunity to know the regular members of the Job Corps yes no

I. I like the Job Corps vocational instructors yes no

J. I like the Job Corps Vocational instructors more than the teachers from my high school yes no

K. The food in the cafeteria there is better than at my high school yes no

4. BEFORE starting the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center, how did you feel about getting a steady job?

(Circle the <u>one</u> answer closest to your feelings)

A. I didn't think about it very much

B. I didn't think I'd have any trouble getting a good job.

C. I figured that I would be able to get some job, even if I didn't like it

D. I did not think I would be able to find a job

5. NOW, how do you feel about getting a steady job?

(Circle the <u>one</u> answer closest to your feelings)

A. I don't think about it very much

B. I don't think I'll have any trouble getting a good job

C. I think that I'll be able to get some job, even if I don't like it

D. I don't think I'll be able to get a job

6. Do you think you will be able to get a better job because of your participation in the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center than if you had not entered the program?

A. Yes B. No

7. Check (✓) how you learned about the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center. If you heard about it from more than one source, check more than one answer. If you heard about it from only one source, check only one.

_____1. A counselor in my high school

_____2. The principal of my high school

_____3. A teacher in my high school

_____4. Some of my friends

_____5. Other students in the school

_____6. I read about it in _____

_____7. Some other source. What is the source?

_____

8. Check (✓) the MOST IMPORTANT influence in your decision to join the commuter program.

_____1. Counselor

_____2. Principal

_____3. Teacher

_____4. Friends

_____5. Other students

_____6. Parents

_____7. None

_____8. Other. What is it?_____

9. If you have any ideas about any part of the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center which have not been included in this questionnaire, please write them in this area

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

A P P E N D I X C

QUESTION 1

Before beginning the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center, what were your ideas toward the program?

(Please circle the letter before the answer closest to your ideas)

A. I was very excited about it
B. I was somewhat excited about it
C. It seemed O.K.
D. It didn't sound very good
E. I didn't want to enter the program

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1

Ogden group:

RESPONSES	FIRST RATINGS NO.	FIRST RATINGS PERCENT	SECOND RATINGS NO.	SECOND RATINGS PERCENT	THRID RATING NO.	THRID RATING PERCENT
A	2	11%	2	29%	2	20%
B	6	33%	2	29%	3	30%
C	9	50%	3	42%	4	40%
D	0	0	0	0	0	0

Box Elder group:

A	5	36%	1	11%	5	28%
B	1	7%	3	33%	8	44%
C	6	43%	4	45%	5	28%
D	2	14%	1	11%	0	0
E	0	0	0	0	0	0

QUESTION 2

After working in the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center, what do you now think about it?

(Please circle the letter before the answer closest to your ideas)

A. I think it is a great program
B. I think it is pretty good
C. It's O.K.
D. I don't think it is very good
E. I don't like it at all

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2

Ogden group:

RESPONSES	FIRST RATINGS NO.	PERCENT	SECOND RATINGS NO.	PERCENT	THIRD RATING NO.	PERCENT
A	8	44%	5	72%	4	40%
B	8	44%	1	14%	3	30%
C	2	12%	1	14%	1	10%
D	0	-	0	-	2	20%
E	0	-	0	-	-	-

Box Elder group:

A	6	42%	5	56%	3	17%
B	4	29%	2	22%	8	44%
C	4	29%	2	22%	3	17%
D	0	-	0	-	3	17%
E	0	-	0	-	1	5%

QUESTION 3

Answer the following questions according to the way you feel about the commuter program at the Job Corps Center

(Circle "yes" or "no" after each question)

A. I entered the Commuter Program mainly because I figured that the training would help me get a job yes no

B. The schedule interferes with other things I'd like to do yes no

C. The Vocational programs offered at the Job Corps Center interest me very much yes no

D. I like the regular corpsmen yes no

E. This kind of training interests me more than what I was taking at my high school yes no

F. I dislike having to travel so far every day yes no

G. I like the atmosphere at the Job Corps Center more than at my high school yes no

H. We do get enough opportunity to know the regular members of the Job Corps yes no

I. I like the Job Corps vocational instructors yes no

J. I like the Job Corps vocational instructors more than the teachers from my high school yes no

K. The fool in the Job Corps' cafeteria is better than in my high school yes no

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3

Ogden group:

RE-	FIRST RATING						SECOND RATING						THIRD RATING					
SPONSE	YES	PCT	NO	PCT	OTHER	PCT	YES	PCT	NO	PCT	OTHER	PCT	YES	PCT	NO	PCT	OTHER	PCT
A	16	89%	2	11%	-	-	6	100%	-	-	-	-	9	90%	1	10%	-	-
B	6	33%	12	67%	-	-	3	49%	2	34%	some 1	17%	5	50%	5	50%	-	-
C	17	94%	1	6%	-	-	7	100%	-	-	-	-	9	90%	1	10%	-	-
D	11	61%	1	6%	some 6	33%	7	100%	-	-	-	-	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%
E	17	94%	1	6%	-	-	5	66%	1	17%	1	17%	7	70%	3	30%	-	-
F	3	16%	14	78%	1	6%	3	43%	4	57%	-	-	3	30%	7	70%	-	-
G	5	28%	12	67%	1	6%	4	49%	2	34%	1	17%	4	40%	5	50%	1	10%
H	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	4	57%	3	43%	-	-	9	90%	1	10%	-	-
I	18	100%	0	-	-	-	7	100%	-	-	-	-	9	90%	1	10%	-	-
J	11	61%	5	28%	2	11%	4	49%	1	17%	2	34%	7	70%	3	30%	-	-
K	12	67%	4	22%	2	11%	7	100%	-	-	-	-	7	70%	3	30%	-	-

Box Elder group:

A	12	86%	2	14%	-	-	7	87%	1	13%	-	-	14	78%	4	22%	-	-
B	7	50%	7	50%	-	-	2	26%	6	74%	-	-	6	34%	12	66%	-	-
C	14	100%	0	-	-	-	9	100%	-	-	-	-	16	88%	2	12%	-	-
D	3	21%	5	37%	6	42%	0	-	4	57%	3	43%	3	17%	15	83%	-	-
E	13	93%	1	7%	-	-	8	100%	-	-	-	-	14	78%	3	17%	1	5%
F	11	79%	3	21%	-	-	4	50%	4	50%	-	-	16	88%	2	12%	-	-
G	10	71%	4	29%	-	-	4	50%	4	50%	-	-	7	39%	11	61%	-	-
H	11	79%	3	21%	-	-	7	87%	1	13%	-	-	16	88%	2	12%	-	-
I	13	93%	1	7%	-	-	8	100%	-	-	-	-	18	100%	-	-	-	-
J	13	93%	1	7%	-	-	8	100%	-	-	-	-	6	34%	9	49%	3	17%
K	10	72%	3	21%	1	7%	5	62%	2	25%	1	13%	14	76%	2	12%	2	12%

QUESTION 4

Before starting the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center, how did you feel about getting a steady job?

(Circle the one answer closest to your feelings)

A. I didn't think about it very much
B. I didn't think I'd have any trouble getting a good job
C. I figured that I'd be able to get some job, even if I didn't like it
D. I didn't think I'd be able to find a job

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4

Ogden group:

RESPONSE	FIRST RATING NO.	FIRST RATING PERCENT	SECOND RATING NO.	SECOND RATING PERCENT	THIRD RATING NO.	THIRD RATING PERCENT
A	4	22%	-	-	3	30%
B	4	22%	-	-	1	10%
C	7	39%	4	57%	5	50%
D	3	17%	3	43%	1	10%

Box Elder group:

A	2	14%	2	22%	11	61%
B	2	14%	1	11%	2	12%
C	4	29%	5	56%	5	27%
D	6	43%	1	11%	-	-

QUESTION 5

Now, how do you feel about getting a steady job?

(Circle the one answer closest to your feelings)

A. I don't think about it very much
B. I don't think I'll have any trouble getting a good job
C. I think that I'll be able to get some job, even if I don't like it
D. I don't think I'll be able to get a job

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 5

Ogden group:

RESPONSE	FIRST RATING NO.	FIRST RATING PERCENT	SECOND RATING NO.	SECOND RATING PERCENT	THIRD RATING NO.	THIRD RATING PERCENT
A	-	-	-	-	1	10%
B	17	94%	7	100%	6	60%
C	1	6%	-	-	3	30%
D	-	-	-	-	-	-

Box Elder group:

A	-	-	-	-	8	44%
B	12	86%	6	67%	6	34%
C	2	14%	2	22%	4	22%
D	-	-	1	11%	-	-

QUESTION 6

Do you think you will be able to get a better job because of your participation in the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center than if you had not entered the program? yes no

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 6

Ogden group:

RESPONSE	FIRST RATING NO.	PERCENT	SECOND RATING NO.	PERCENT	THIRD RATING NO.	PERCENT
YES	17	94%	5	84%	7	70%
NO	1	6%	1	16%	2	20%
NO RESPONSE					1	10%

Box Elder group:

YES	13	93%	8	100%	7	39%
NO	1	7%	-	-	11	61%
NO RESPONSE						

QUESTION 7

Check (x) before the way in which you learned about the commuter program at the Clearfield Job Corps Center. If you heard about it from more than one source, check more than one answer. If you heard about it from only one source, check only one.

_____1. A counselor in my high school
_____2. The principal of my high school
_____3. A teacher in my high school
_____4. Some of my friends
_____5. Other students in the school
_____6. I read about it in _____.
_____7. Some other source. What is the source? _____.

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 7

QUESTION NO.	OGDEN GROUP	BOX ELDER GROUP
1	10	9
2	3	5
3	5	6
4	13	5
5	9	2
6	0	0
7	2 (Institute)	1 (Employment Service)

QUESTION 8

Check (x) the MOST IMPORTANT influence in your decision to join the commuter program.

_____1. Counselor
_____2. Principal
_____3. Teacher
_____4. Friends
_____5. Other Students
_____6. Parents
_____7. None
_____8. Other: What was it? _____

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 8

QUESTION NO.	OGDEN GROUP	BOX ELDER GROUP
1	2	4
2	0	3
3	3	5
4	6	4
5	2	2
6	6	5
7	2	0
8	5 (School boring 1) (Self 4)	6 (Judge 1) (Self 5)

A P P E N D I X D

COMMENTS ON THE PROGRAM BY THE TRAINEES

Comments Heard From Both Groups

Facilities: Very adequate. Equipment is better in both variety and quality than what is available at the high school.

Coordinators: Students are quite happy with their coordinators. The Box Elder group had no complaints whatever. The only complaint from the Ogden group was that Mr. Draayer was occupied at times by his coaching duties which took him away from the group, and caused inconveniences when they had problems which required more or less immediate attention. But the rapport between trainees and coordinator did not seem to be affected thereby.

Transportation: Both groups complained about their transportation, but for different reasons. The Job Corps-furnished bus for the Ogden group is said to be constantly late, both in picking up the trainees and returning them to their homes. The Box Elder group complains that their bus, furnished by the Box Elder School District, is the oldest and least comportable in the fleet; and considering the time spent in commuting, they feel they deserve a better one.

Vocational Instruction: Instruction is better than that received at the high school. The teachers are more understanding and give more individual attention to the trainees. There were exceptions to those general comments, however, in three areas: woodworking and heavy equipment operation, where the complaint was lack of individual attention from the instructor due to class size; and from the medical area where the teacher resigned after the corpsmen were nearly ready for on-the-job training (OJT)--the teacher had so stated and the JC was looking for jobs in which to place them, according to their understanding--but the new teacher felt they were not ready. Result: Several boys dropped out of the program and two others switched to different vocational clusters.

Choosing a Vocational Area: Boys are allowed to choose their own without benefit of guidance or aptitude tests. Most were well-satisfied with their choice; four had switched to a different cluster, two from each group. (Indications are that several dropped out because of a poor choice--this is implicit in the reasons given for their withdrawl.) In response to a question from the principal investigator, the trainees in both groups unanimously agreed that aptitude tests would be helpful to them in choosing their vocational cluster if they were allowed to use them only as a guide.

Continuing the Program: In response to a question as to whether the program should be continued for the benefit of future corpsmen, the reaction was 100 percent in the affirmative. One student commented that if this program were discontinued, he would never return to high school. (Whether he would or not seems irrelevant; the point would seem to be that this program very effectively meets this boy's needs).

Comments Heard Only From the Box Elder Group

Shop Clothing: Students feel they should be provided with same clothing as the regular job corpmen are.

Food: Good but too expensive for the trainees' budgets. They coupled this complaint with the fact that so many hours were involved in the project that they were unable to hold part-time jobs so as to be able to afford lunches at that price.

Pay: For the same reason mentioned above under Food, some of the students complained that they should be paid--at least, for OJT.

Standing at their School: Trainees from Box Elder complained of the following: Having to pay the standard fees at the school, including activity fees. Of course, these students were enrolled at the beginning of school, but they felt they should get a refund since they were only there October 14--about seven weeks. They were particularly bothered by the activity fee because they were subjected to what they considered harassment when they went to school functions (i.e., smelling their breath before they were admitted to school dances).

Prospects of Graduation: A general lack of understanding as to their prospects of graduation prevailed. Most were confused as to the credits to be given for their vocational training and how long they had to stay at the Job Corp Center in order to graduate. It was also plain that some were just not interested in graduating from anything other than possibly the vocational program at the Job Corp Center.

Comments Heard Only From The Ogden Group

Job Corps Competitions: Several students from Ogden desired to participate in an engine analysis-troubleshooting competition being held for the regular jobs corpman. In the past they have been allowed to compete in some contests. This specific question was assigned to the coordinator for solution, but the trainees would like to feel that they are a part of the Job Corp Center to the extent of participation in these contests without special clarification and permission as each case arises.

Use of Gymnasium: The commuter corpsmen have an hour per week set aside for physical training, athletics, etc. They would like to see this increased to three hours per week.

Summer School: Those trainees who will not finish up their vocational training before the regular school year ends would like to continue right on through the summer months.

A P P E N D I X E

Trainee's Name _____

Instructor's Name _____ Form A

Vocational Cluster _____ Date _____

Please rate the Corpsman Trainee named above on each of the following behaviors:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Reliability					
1. Attends regularly	1	2	3	4	5
2. Reports on time	1	2	3	4	5
3. Completes assignments	1	2	3	4	5
4. Follows instructions	1	2	3	4	5
5. Can perform assigned tasks with minimum supervision	1	2	3	4	5
Cooperation					
1. Follows established rules	1	2	3	4	5
2. Respects the rights of others	1	2	3	4	5
3. Gets along with fellow students and trainees	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gets along with supervisors	1	2	3	4	5
5. Follows directions	1	2	3	4	5
Responsibility					
1. Accepts delegated responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
2. Accepts constructive criticism and suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
3. Aids others in accepting and fulfilling responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
4. Will seek help with serious problems	1	2	3	4	5
Initiative					
1. Voluntarily performs necessary tasks	1	2	3	4	5
2. Attempts to solve problems on his own	1	2	3	4	5
3. Makes constructive suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
4. Will seek additional information when needed	1	2	3	4	5
Attitude					
1. Is neat in grooming and appearance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Exhibits a desire to work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Takes pride in work	1	2	3	4	5
4. Is adaptable to changing situations	1	2	3	4	5
5. Derives personal satisfaction from his work	1	2	3	4	5

A P P E N D I X E

Trainee's Name_____

Social Security Number _____ Form C

Vocational Cluster_____ Date_____

Please rate yourself on each of the following behaviors by circling the number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 after each question. Thank you!

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Reliability					
1. Attends regularly	1	2	3	4	5
2. Reports on time	1	2	3	4	5
3. Completes assignments	1	2	3	4	5
4. Follows instructions	1	2	3	4	5
5. Can perform assigned tasks with minimum supervision	1	2	3	4	5
Cooperation					
1. Follows established rules	1	2	3	4	5
2. Respects the rights of others	1	2	3	4	5
3. Gets along with fellow students and trainees	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gets along with supervisors	1	2	3	4	5
5. Follows directions	1	2	3	4	5
Responsibility					
1. Accepts delegated responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
2. Accepts constructive criticism and suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
3. Aids others in accepting and fulfilling responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
4. Will seek help with serious problems	1	2	3	4	5
Initiative					
1. Voluntarily performs necessary tasks	1	2	3	4	5
2. Attempts to solve problems on his own	1	2	3	4	5
3. Makes constructive suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
4. Will seek additional information when needed	1	2	3	4	5
Attitude					
1. Is neat in grooming and appearance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Exhibits a desire to work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Takes pride in work	1	2	3	4	5
4. Is adaptable to changing situations	1	2	3	4	5
5. Derives personal satisfaction from his work	1	2	3	4	5

A P P E N D I X E

TRAINEE EVALUATION

This evaluation was completed by the trainee, his coordinator, his Job Corps instructor and the Ogden High School teachers involved. Copies of the forms used are attached as Appendix G.

The first evaluation took place about mid-January and the results are set forth below.

A. Ogden High School Group: (Evaluations of the Trainees)

CRITERIA	*RANGE	SELF		JCC INSTR.		HS COORD.		OHS TEACHERS	
		NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT
Reliability	1.0-1.9	10	56%	12	67%	03	17%	01	06%
	2.0-2.9	18	44%	06	33%	12	66%	12	66%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	--	--	03	17%	05	28%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cooperation	1.0-1.9	12	67%	14	78%	03	17%	02	11%
	2.0-2.9	06	33%	04	22%	14	77%	11	61%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	--	--	01	06%	05	28%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Responsibility	1.0-1.9	06	33%	09	50%	02	11%	01	06%
	2.0-2.9	11	61%	09	50%	10	56%	09	50%
	3.0-3.9	01	06%	--	--	06	33%	05	28%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	03	16%
Initiative	1.0-1.9	03	16%	03	17%	01	06%	--	--
	2.0-2.9	13	72%	13	72%	09	50%	09	50%
	3.0-3.9	02	11%	02	11%	08	44%	06	33%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	07	39%
Attitude	1.0-1.9	12	67%	13	72%	01	06%	--	--
	2.0-2.9	06	33%	05	28%	10	56%	08	44%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	--	--	07	38%	08	44%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	02	12%

B. Box Elder High School Group (Evaluation of the Trainees)

CRITERIA	*RANGE	SELF		JCC INSTR.		HS COORD.	
		NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT
Reliability	1.0-1.9	09	64%	07	50%	06	43%
	2.0-2.9	05	36%	06	43%	06	43%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	01	07%	02	14%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cooperation	1.0-1.9	11	79%	06	43%	04	28%
	2.0-2.9	03	21%	08	57%	08	57%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	--	--	02	13%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Responsibility	1.0-1.9	05	36%	07	50%	03	21%
	2.0-2.9	09	64%	07	50%	06	43%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	--	--	04	29%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	01	07%
Initiative	1.0-1.9	03	21%	04	28%	02	14%
	2.0-2.9	08	58%	09	65%	05	36%
	3.0-3.9	03	21%	--	--	05	36%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	07%	02	14%
Attitude	1.0-1.9	08	57%	07	50%	06	44%
	2.0-2.9	05	36%	06	43%	04	28%
	3.0-3.9	01	07%	--	--	04	28%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	07%	--	--

The number given is derived by averaging the answers given under each criterion. The range may be understood as follows:

1.0-1.9 -- Always (reliable, cooperative, etc.)
2.0-2.9 -- Usually
3.0-3.9 -- Sometimes
4.0-5.0 -- Rarely/Never

The evaluation covered 18 Ogden trainees and 14 Box Elder trainees on which all of the evaluation sheets had been returned. Because of the nature of the program being evaluated, the Box Elder group has not been rated by Box Elder High teachers--these trainees have their basic education courses from their coordinator, who has rated them from knowledge gained as teacher and coordinator.

The second set of evaluation forms were sent out about one month after the optimum time of mid-March. The results from that evaluation follow, an evaluation completed as far as known, of those still in the program as of the end of March. Those completing the reports were asked to confine their evaluations, so far as possible, to the period from January

26 to March 31. All forms returned were utilized for those boys still in the program. It should be noted, however, that a number of instructors at the Job Corps Center failed to follow instructions and, for boys who had dropped out during April, sent back a blank evaluation form for the period noted above. In addition, a number of Ogden teachers failed to return their forms, although at least one form was completed for all but one boy.

Second Period

A. Ogden High School Group (Evaluations of the Trainees)

CRITERIA	*RANGE	7 Responses SELF		12 Responses JCC INSTR.		12 Responses HS COORD.		12 Responses OHS TEACHERS	
		NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT
Reliability	1.0-1.9	05	71%	04	33%	--	--	--	--
	2.0-2.9	02	29%	03	25%	04	33%	04	33%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	03	25%	07	58%	02	17%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	02	17%	01	09%	06	50%
Cooperation	1.0-1.9	05	71%	06	50%	01	09%	01	09%
	2.0-2.9	02	29%	04	33%	04	33%	04	33%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	02	17%	05	42%	02	17%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	02	16%	05	41%
Responsibility	1.0-1.9	04	57%	06	50%	01	09%	01	09%
	2.0-2.9	03	43%	03	25%	03	25%	03	25%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	02	17%	06	50%	03	25%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	08%	02	16%	05	41%
Initiative	1.0-1.9	04	57%	02	17%	--	--	--	--
	2.0-2.9	02	29%	06	50%	04	33%	02	16%
	3.0-3.9	01	14%	03	25%	07	58%	03	25%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	08%	01	09%	07	59%
Attitude	1.0-1.9	05	71%	04	33%	--	--	--	--
	2.0-2.9	02	29%	03	25%	03	25%	03	25%
	3.0-3.9	--	--	03	25%	07	58%	04	33%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	02	17%	02	17%	05	42%

Second Period

B. Box Elder High School Group (Evaluation of the Trainees)

CRITERIA	RANGE	9 Responses SELF		12 Responses JCC INSTR.		9 Responses HS COORD.	
		NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT
Reliability	1.0-1.9	03	33%	02	17%	02	22%
	2.0-2.9	05	55%	08	67%	04	44%
	3.0-3.9	01	12%	01	08%	02	22%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	08%	01	12%
Cooperation	1.0-1.9	03	33%	05	42%	01	11%
	2.0-2.9	04	44%	05	42%	06	67%
	3.0-3.9	02	23%	01	08%	01	11%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	08%	01	11%
Responsibility	1.0-1.9	03	33%	03	25%	01	11%
	2.0-2.9	05	55%	05	41%	03	33%
	3.0-3.9	01	12%	02	17%	03	33%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	02	17%	02	23%
Initiative	1.0-1.9	02	23%	03	25%	01	11%
	2.0-2.9	04	44%	05	41%	03	33%
	3.0-3.9	03	33%	02	17%	01	11%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	02	17%	04	45%
Attitude	1.0-1.9	03	33%	02	16%	02	22%
	2.0-2.9	05	55%	06	50%	04	44%
	3.0-3.9	01	12%	02	17%	02	22%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	02	17%	01	12%

Evaluation forms for the third period were sent out during early May for completion during the last week of school. The student self-evaluation forms were misplaced somewhere in the shuffle between the center and the State Board of Education. Forms were redistributed to the students in September and returned to the State Board. In order to insure that responses would be accurate, forms were mailed to all known participants. Although there were only nine Box Elder students involved in the third period training program, 18 completed forms were received by this office.

Third Period

A. Ogden High School Group (Evaluations of the Trainees)

CRITERIA	*RANGE	10 Responses SELF		10 Responses JCC INSTR.		10 Responses HS COORD.		10 Responses OHS TEACHERS	
		NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT
Reliability	1.0-1.9	05	50%	03	30%	--	--	--	--
	2.0-2.9	04	40%	03	30%	03	30%	04	40%
	3.0-3.9	01	10%	03	30%	05	50%	04	40%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	10%	02	20%	02	20%
Cooperation	1.0-1.9	07	70%	05	50%	01	10%	--	--
	2.0-2.9	02	20%	04	40%	03	30%	03	30%
	3.0-3.9	01	10%	01	10%	04	40%	04	40%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	02	20%	04	40%
Responsibility	1.0-1.9	05	50%	05	50%	01	10%	01	10%
	2.0-2.9	04	40%	03	30%	02	20%	03	30%
	3.0-3.9	01	10%	--	--	05	50%	04	40%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	02	20%	02	20%
Initiative	1.0-1.9	04	40%	02	20%	--	--	--	--
	2.0-2.9	04	40%	04	40%	03	30%	03	20%
	3.0-3.9	01	10%	03	30%	04	40%	03	30%
	4.0-5.0	01	10%	01	10%	03	30%	05	50%
Attitude	1.0-1.9	07	70%	04	40%	--	--	--	--
	2.0-2.9	02	20%	03	30%	02	20%	02	20%
	3.0-3.9	01	10%	02	20%	05	50%	04	40%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	10%	03	30%	04	40%

B. Box Elder High School Group (Evaluation of the Trainees)

CRITERIA	*RANGE	18 Responses SELF		9 Responses JCC INSTR.		9 Responses HS COORD.	
		NO	PCT	NO	PCT	NO	PCT
Reliability	1.0-1.9	01	05%	03	33%	01	11%
	2.0-2.9	11	61%	03	33%	06	67%
	3.0-3.9	06	34%	02	22%	01	11%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	12%	01	11%
Cooperation	1.0-1.9	01	05%	04	44%	01	11%
	2.0-2.9	11	61%	04	44%	06	67%
	3.0-3.9	06	34%	01	12%	01	11%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	01	11%
Responsibility	1.0-1.9	01	05%	03	33%	01	11%
	2.0-2.9	12	67%	03	34%	03	33%
	3.0-3.9	05	28%	03	33%	01	11%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	--	--	04	45%

Third Period, Box Elder Group, Continued

CRITERIA	*RANGE	18 Responses SELF NO	18 Responses SELF PCT	9 Responses JCC INSTR. NO	9 Responses JCC INSTR. PCT	9 Responses HS COORD. NO	9 Responses HS COORD. PCT
Initiative	1.0-1.9	01	05%	02	22%	02	22%
	2.0-2.0	12	67%	04	44%	04	44%
	3.0-3.9	05	28%	02	22%	02	22%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	01	12%	01	12%
Attitude	1.0-1.9	01	05%	03	33%	02	22%
	2.0-2.9	09	50%	02	22%	04	44%
	3.0-3.9	08	45%	02	22%	02	22%
	4.0-5.0	--	--	02	23%	01	12%

A P P E N D I X F

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COMMUTER JOB CORPS PARTICIPANTS 1968-69

1. What did you do this summer?

   A. Work; please specify: (1) Job related to Commuter Job Corps training.
   (2) Job <u>not</u> related to Commuter Job Corps training.

   B. Summer school
   C. Loafed
   D. Other; please specify: _____

2. Are you back in high school? A. Yes B. No

   If above answer is "no" have you graduated from high school? A. Yes B. No

3. Are you in any other educational or vocational training program?

   A. Yes; please specify: (1) Salt Lake High School
   (2) Technical school
   (3) Job Corps
   (4) Commuter Job Corps

   B. No

4. If not back in high school or participating in a specialized training program, what are you now doing?

   A. Military service
   B. Work; please specify: (1) In a field related to Commuter Job Corps training
   (2) In a field <u>not</u> related to Commuter Job Corps training

   C. Other; please specify: _____

5. If back in school, do you feel that your Commuter Job Corps training has given you

   A. A greater interest in completing high school
   B. Less interest in completing high school
   C. Greater interest in a particular vocational field

6. If not back in school and are working, do you

   A. Feel that the Commter Job Corps program helped you to get a better job than you would have been able to obtain without the training?

   (1) A lot (2) A little (3) Some (4) None (5) Do not know

   B. Feel that the Commuter Job Corps program helped you achieve greater success in your job than you would have achieved without that training?

   (1) A lot (2) A little (3) Some (4) None (5) Do not know

RESULTS

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COMMUTER JOB CORPS PARTICIPANTS 1968-1969
RESPONSES

	No. of responses	Percent
1. What did you do this summer?		
A. Work:		
Related to training	2	14%
Not related to training	9	65%
B. Summer school	0	0
C. Loafed	1	7%
D. Other (Neighborhood Youth Corps, Navy)	2	14%
2. Are you back in high school?		
A. Yes	5	36%
B. No (3 of these completed graduation requirements)	9	64%
3. Are you in any other educational or vocational training program?		
A. Yes (U.S. Army, U.S. Navy, Ogden H.S. automechanics program)	3	22%
B. No	11	78%
4. If not back in high school or participating in a specialized training program, what are you now doing?		
A. Military service	3	21%
B. Work:		
Related to training	2	14%
Not related to training	1	7%
C. Other (nothing, Neighborhood Youth Corps, trying to return to school)	3	21%
D. No response	5	37%
5. If back in school, do you feel that your Commuter Job Corps training has given you--		
A. A greater interest in completing high school	4	28%
B. Less interest in completing high school	1	7%
C. Greater interest in a particular vocational field	3	21%
D. No response	6	44%
6. If not back in school and are working, do you--		
A. Feel that the Commuter Job Corps Program helped you to get a better job than you would have been able to obtain without the training?		
1. A lot	2	14%
2. A little	2	14%
3. Some	0	
4. None	2	14%
5. Do not know	8	58%
B. Feel that the Commuter Job Corps Program helped you achieve greater success in your job than you would have achieved without that training?		
1. A lot	1	7%
2. A little	2	14%
3. Some	1	7%
4. None	2	14%
5. Do not know	8	58%

A P P E N D I X G

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONTROL GROUP
(Commuter Job Corps Project 1968-1969)

1. What did you do this summer?

   A. Work
   B. Summer school
   C. Loafed
   D. Other; please specify: _____

2. Are you back in high school?

   A. Yes
   B. No

3. Are you in any other educational or vocational training program?

   A. Yes, please specify:
      (1) Salt Lake High School
      (2) Technical school
      (3) Job Corps
      (4) Other; please specify: _____
   B. No

4. If you are not back in school or participating in a specialized training program, what are you doing now?

   A. Military service
   B. Working
   C. Other; please specify: _____

RESULTS

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONTROL GROUP
(Commuter Job Corps Project 1968-69)

	Number of Responses	Percent
1. What did you do this summer?		
A. Work	12	80%
B. Summer school	0	0
C. Loafed	2	13%
D. Other (Upward Bound)	1	7%
2. Are you back in high school?		
A. Yes	7	47%
B. No	8	53%
3. Are you in any other educational or vocational training program?		
A. Yes	0	0
B. No	15	100%
4. If you are not back in school or participating in a specialized training program, what are you now doing?		
A. Military Service	1	12%
B. Work	4	50%
C. Other (College, looking for work)	3	38%